Teacher Guide Section 5

18 Conflict and peace

General
The chapters in Section 5 provide suggestions for individual research and group projects as well as a practice written examination.

Encourage students to use their responses to the activities in Skills Section 5 to help them to work independently on individual research and group projects.

Encourage students to refer to Skills Sections 3, 4 and 5 to remind themselves of the skills they need to apply and the processes they have learned for planning a line of inquiry and planning a project.

Always download and use the most recent mark scheme to help students to assess their practice written examinations.

Guidance to practice written examination
Skills not knowledge
Remember that the written examination is testing Global Perspectives skills, not knowledge of the topic content. To date the questions have always followed the pattern below.

Question 1: Identify and analyse issues, considering problems, solutions, causes, consequences, perspectives and opinions. This can include identifying reasons, specific bits of evidence, perspectives and so on, as well as making suggestions and giving explanations.

Question 2: Plan a line of inquiry. This is usually about identifying gaps in knowledge or things students need to know, and working out how to find this information. This can be by framing questions to particular people, designing a small survey or suggesting an experiment or research project. It often requires students to identify specific information that they need to know for a particular purpose, and explain how this information will help. This question could address the project planning process.

Question 3: Question information and reasoning. This section can include questions about the reliability of sources, about the difference between facts, opinions and value judgments and about the quality of reasoning.

Question 4: Develop a line of reasoning. There is usually one long question, which may be a standard essay-type question. Other kinds of question may appear, such as a debate in which students have to make a case for one proposal, one use of energy and so on. Students may use, develop or argue against material from the resource booklet. They may also use any knowledge they have or opinions and perspectives of their own. No specific knowledge is required.
Note that the questions more or less follow the Global Perspectives learning process of: collect; question; reflect and plan; present and act. The skill of reflecting is rarely tested specifically but students who reflect on the issues tend to develop better reasoning in question 4.

**Vocabulary and concepts**

No specific knowledge, vocabulary or concepts are required for the written paper. In fact, specific knowledge can lead a student to write down what they know rather than responding to the questions. However, students may be more within their comfort zones if some subject-specific vocabulary and concepts are familiar to them. For this reason, it may be useful to do skills development exercises from a variety of topics that haven’t otherwise been used in the course. Another possible activity would be to organise debates and discussions on topics that haven’t been formally studied, in order to familiarise students with key concepts and vocabulary. Students can evaluate each others’ reasoning (using red cards for a weakness, perhaps), and the activity leads nicely into development of written reasoning.

**Mark schemes**

Always download and use the most recent CIE Global Perspectives mark scheme to help prepare students for assessment. Most of the questions are marked by levels, so you can adapt the marking grids to the questions in this chapter. For instance, quite a number of question parts, especially in questions 1, 2 and 3 in 2012 were marked according to levels which can be summarised as:

- **Level 3**: Strong and supported reasoning, directly relevant to the question.
- **Level 2**: Some description generally relevant to the question.
- **Level 1**: Simple description, general and not specific to the question.

This general guide can be adapted to each question. Students can use this to learn what counts as simple description, what counts as relevant to the question and so on. Even weaker students, given the tools to understand how their answers are marked, can often identify what they need to do to achieve the next level.

Question papers and mark schemes evolve over time, and it is in students’ interests to use the most recent versions. For instance, in June 2011, the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Question answered precisely and logically, supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Logically linked, coherent structure to the reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates have made effective use of relevant ideas in the resource booklet as reasons to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their view and/or added their own relevant ideas. These ideas may be completely new, or they may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be expansion of or response to existing material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant different point/s of view from candidate’s own ideas or selected from resource booklet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thoughtful consideration of different point/s of view AND strong explanation of why disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which really answers the different point of view OR possibly a suggestion of a compromise position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between different points of view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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However, in November 2012 (the most recent mark scheme available at the time of writing) the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:

| Level 5  
| 16–18 marks  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good, well supported and logical reasoning and judgments about the effects of the internet. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation of a range of internet effects on thinking – usually 4 or more. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 4 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that there is now a quantitative element: “usually 4 or more”. This works down through the levels. Note also that the specific detail on how students deal with different points of view has been replaced with “the response is balanced”.

Look out for further developments, and make sure that your students are as prepared as possible.

**Indicative content**

This section provides indicative content for the practice paper. Accept other reasonable responses (and allow students to discuss what a reasonable response might be and why). Accept a variety of levels of sophistication, and encourage students to find the level on the most recent mark scheme that matches their performance.

Note that Conflictia is based on Liberia and is a real, if limited, case study.

**Question 1**

(a) They teach focus and concentration (which can lead to better performance at school); it helps to get rid of frustrations after a bad day; martial arts are good for your body and soul; a martial art can teach you vital skills like self-defence and self-control.

(b) The diagram below is an example of what a student could produce.

[Diagram of a flowchart showing Historic migration, Recent migration, Resettled former slaves, Land and constitution, Different ethnic, religious and tribal groups with different social and economic status, Misunderstanding, Poverty, Foreign intervention, War, Breakdown of the state, Diamonds, Corrupt governments, Child soldiers who only know fighting.]
Question 2

(a)(i) Study and compare people who have done a martial art (for more than one year, for example) and those who have not. Look for evidence that those who have studied a martial art get into more fights than others, or are better at school than others.

(ii) It would be difficult to isolate cause and consequence. For instance, you may find that more aggressive people tend to do martial arts, so you wouldn’t be sure if it was martial arts making them aggressive or their natural aggression showing – what is cause and what is consequence? Or you might find that people who are involved in any kind of regular training are more focused, less likely to fight and more able to concentrate than those who are not, so it might be the physical activity or the commitment and not the martial art itself that helped. Also, people who engage in a regular activity outside of school are likely to have supportive parents, and to engage in more than one activity, so it can be really difficult to identify the cause, even if you can isolate the consequence.

(b)(i) For research you could send people such as journalists, doctors, charity workers, academics or teachers to see the situation and talk to the people. Also you could read the newspapers, search the internet, and look at blogs, photos and social media sites.

(ii) The situation in Conflictia is extremely complex. Anyone you sent would only have a view of part of the situation, so you would have to try to piece together a whole view. Any individual you send or talk to would have his or her own perspective, and in a war situation this can be very emotional and not really related to reality. People have emotional reasons to lie about their own guilt, and to portray the other side worse than it is. Also there may be physical danger for anyone in a war zone. Religious beliefs and disagreements can confuse the picture. Communications are difficult in war situations – post, internet, phones may not be working. Anything online could be unreliable because of bias, reason to lie, emotional interference and so on. Newspapers could be censored or funded by one side or the other.

Question 3

(a)(i) The refugee would have escaped from a threatening and frightening situation – refugees are not fleeing from safe, objective situations but from terrible ones. This person would have been in a position to see, but not to see the whole situation. So they are a first-hand witness, but this isn’t enough to make them reliable. This person will also have emotional attachments and a bias towards one group – what would bring a successful peace for this person may be a disaster for others, so this person is not fully reliable.

(ii) The speaker limits the options. “The only way ...” is a very strong claim and it is not supported here. It also seems inconsistent to say that the only way to bring peace is to fund weapons, especially nuclear weapons. Also having been to a place is not the same as having a clear understanding of a complex situation with all its causes and consequences. So it seems that this person is not very logical.
(b) Katie’s reasoning is more effective. She is calm and reasoned, giving reasons, examples and evidence to support her opinions. Nick, on the other hand, speaks from prejudice. He’s emotional, he doesn’t listen to Katie’s arguments and he predicts unrealistic consequences. In addition, his actions contradict his opinions – he is the one to become aggressive and violent, not the girl with the black belt.

Nick: “Everyone knows …” Prejudice, swiftly followed by a slippery slope (disastrous reasoning, unconnected and illogical consequences) from teaching people to be violent, to teaching people how to use guns, to civil war and the end of civilised society.

Katie: Gives a reason why martial arts are good – focus and concentration – and links this to education. Her reasoning is measured and thoughtful and the consequences she suggests are plausible – learning focus and concentration could reasonably help at school.

Nick: Dismissed Katie’s argument by insulting her because she’s only a girl rather than listening to what she says and thinking about how to argue against it. He doesn’t give reasons, “It’s so obviously wrong …”. He makes sweeping statements, “They should all be banned”. As Katie’s response shows, this can’t be supported.

Katie: Answers Nick’s points thoughtfully. She might be wrong about the number of undisciplined fights on football fields versus among people who do martial arts, but our general experience tells us that there are undisciplined fights on football fields. She’s also got a point when she asks “So, you couldn’t hurt anyone with the skills you use to kick a football?” You could, of course, hurt someone by kicking them. So, by implication, unless you also want to ban football because you can use the skills to hurt people, it would be odd to ban martial arts because you can use the skills to hurt people. On the other hand, the point of martial arts is to fight and cause harm, whereas the point of football is to kick a ball into a net, so there is an important difference there which Katie does not address. Katie also gives Nick a reason why she knows what she is talking about, and gives a reasonable personal example of stress relief from martial arts. She doesn’t claim that she is talking for everyone, just that this is her own personal feeling, so she is not being too general.

Nick: Just disagrees, gets emotional and uses violence. This is a bad argument, and also contradicts some of what he has been saying.

Katie: Katie demonstrates self-defence, illustrating a useful aspect of a martial art. She tells us that she has also used self-control and has not hurt Nick. We only have her word for it, but it is a reasonable claim, as we can’t hear Nick groaning in pain!

Question 4

Options have been provided as part of the practice exam paper. Examples are suggested here for some more detailed development of three of the suggested ideas.

- Funding one group so that there is a victor who can form an unchallenged government is a superficially appealing prospect. It would be good for Conflictia to have an end to war, and to have a government which could start rebuilding the state, getting education,
infrastructure and governance back in place. This option would also allow us to fund the group which we think is best, perhaps because it shares our ideals, our religion, or perhaps because they would cooperate with us economically. However, the possible negative consequences seem more likely than the possible positive consequences. It seems more likely that funding one group would lead to worse warfare, more violence and more suffering, especially if other countries are funding other groups. One government led by a victor may not lead to the most positive consequences for all the people. Instead, it might lead to a government which unfairly favours some of the people. Therefore this is not the best option.

- Sending our own army would provide a display of our power, and might make a point, but it would have similar disadvantages, might be against international laws, would lead to our own people being killed in someone else’s war, would be expensive and might leave us vulnerable to other threats. Therefore that isn’t the best option either.

- Providing a neutral space for negotiation to achieve an agreed peace seems very appealing. It wouldn’t be against any international laws, and is more likely to lead to a lasting peace than fuelling aggression and conflict. It would, of course, be frustrating and slow. Sometimes in these situations, it is almost impossible to get the different groups to be in the same room and talk to each other, but, without a neutral space for negotiation, it can’t happen. So the possible consequences of this option are good, even if they are not likely, and the negative consequences are not that bad, and this is not illegal or immoral. Therefore we should choose this option.